

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 4, 2005, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Lin, et al. USP 6,765,228. Claims 6-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or 103 as anticipated by or obvious over Yong, et al. 6,844,631.

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 6-17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites as integrated circuit device comprising a semiconductor substrate, a plurality of metal layers on the substrate and a plurality of bonding pads on top of the metal layers. Each bonding pad has a bonding area located above a region where each of the metal layers overlap and an elongated probing area located above a subset of the metal layers. As indicated in the specification at page 10, lines 15-23, the full set of metal layers under the bonding area is used to sustain the pressure caused by bonding equipment. However, as indicated at page 10, lines 23-25, a smaller number of metal layers can be used under the probing area because the wafer probing pressure is significantly smaller. Indeed, only five metal layers M2, M3, M7, M8, M9 are shown under probing area 380 in applicants' Figure 4.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the '631 patent does not disclose a structure in which the probing area is located above a subset of the metal layers. The Examiner has correctly identified the metal layers of the semiconductor device of Fig. 3 of the '631 patent as layers 28, 30 and 32. Inspection of Fig. 3 reveals that each of these layers is located beneath both probe 47 and bonding area 48.

Since the '631 patent does not disclose each of the elements of claim 6, the rejection of claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 as anticipated by the '631 patent must be withdrawn. Claim 8 is believed patentable for the same reason claim 6 is patentable.

Claim 11 has been amended to add to the claim a recitation similar to that of claim 6 specifying that the bonding area is located above a region where all the conductive paths overlap while the probing area is located above a region where less than all the conductive paths overlap. Since the '631 patent does not disclose each of the elements of amended claim 11, the rejection of claims 11-16 as anticipated by the '631 patent must be withdrawn. Claim 17 is believed patentable for the same reason claim 11 is patentable.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims of this application are believed to be patentable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 1, 2005

  
Francis E. Morris 24,615  
(Reg. No.)  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
(212) 309 6632  
Customer No. 048591